

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The present application has been reviewed in light of the Non-Final Office Action dated July 30, 2007. Claims 2, 10, 12, 13, 24 and 26 has been amended. Claims 1, 3, 23 and 25 remain cancelled without intending to abandon or to dedicate to the public any patentable subject matter. Accordingly, Claims 2, 4-22, 24 and 26 are now pending.

The Examiner has object to Claims 2 and 24 for containing various informalities. The Examiner has rejected Claims 2, 4-22, 24 and 26 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over United States Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0115088 to Thompson (“Thompson”) in view of United States Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0156692 to Squeglia et al (“Sgueglia”). As set forth herein, reconsideration and withdrawal of the objections and rejections of the claims are respectfully requested.

Regarding the claim objections, Claims 2 and 24 have been amended to change “on the worker” to “about the worker.” Additionally, Claim 4 has been amended to change “on the worker” to “about the worker.” Claim 24 has been amended to change “form” to “from.” Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the objections are respectfully requested.

Regarding the claim rejections, the Applicants respectfully request that this rejection be withdrawn for the following reasons: Independent Claim 2 has been amended to clarify the difference between the present invention and the cited references. Claim 2 includes the step of sending necessary-part information from the management server to the worker terminal and a transport person terminal used by a transport person who transports parts to the work place. The necessary-part information is discriminated from the reception information and includes identifiers for parts necessary for the selected work item and a quantity of the necessary parts.

In the invention according to Claim 2, since the necessary-part information is sent to the worker terminal, the worker can get the necessary-part information without stopping at the management center or the warehouse for parts before going to the work place. In other words, the worker does not need to stop at the management center or warehouse for parts before going to the work place for getting the necessary-part information. This reduces the burden on the worker. In addition, since the necessary-part information is sent to the transport person terminal,

the transport person can deliver the necessary parts to the work place. Therefore, the worker need not prepare and carry the parts, thus reducing the burden on the worker.

Thompson is directed to an architecture in which suppliers 12 create requests, which are transmitted to an agent 16. The agent 16, using a requirements database 22, task database 26, task module 24, prioritizing module 28, routing module 30, and manager module 32, generates and transmits to clients (associated with workers) tasks from the requests and then facilitates and optimizes the scheduling, prioritizing, routing, and monitoring of tasks to be completed at retail locations 14. Thompson does not teach receiving acceptance information from the worker regarding which tasks the worker desires to perform (see paragraph [0040]-[0042]) or, as admitted by the Examiner, sending necessary part information, including necessary part identifiers, and a quantity of necessary parts to either the worker terminal or a transport person terminal used by a transport person to transport parts to the work place.

Squeglia discloses a method and system for managing supply of replacement parts. According to paragraphs [0058-0059] and Fig. 6, if the repair has not been completed (step 122:NO), it is determined whether a new part is needed to complete the repair (step 128). If a new part is needed, the portable unit 14 communicates with service shop 16 to requisition the part (step 132). According to paragraph [0086] and Fig. 8, an input/output device 302 (Fig. 9) provided at a service site communicates with a database 301 (Fig. 9) storing parts supply data to order the parts.

As mentioned above, Squeglia discloses that, during a repair, the worker requests the parts necessary for the repair to the service center by using the portable unit. In other words, Squeglia discloses that the necessary part is requested from the worker terminal to the service center. However, Squeglia fails to disclose that necessary-part information is sent from a management server to both a worker terminal and a transport person terminal used by a transport person who transports parts to the work place, as recited by Claim 2.

To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), the Examiner must show that: (1) the references teach all of the elements of the claimed invention, (2) the references contain some teaching, suggestion or motivation to combine the references, and (3)

*Application Serial No. 10/683,570
Reply to Office Action of July 30, 2007*

the references suggest a reasonable expectation of success. See MPEP §2142. See also *In re Vaeck*, 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991); *In re Kotzab*, 217 F.3d 1365, 55 USPQ2d 1313 (Fed. Cir. 2000). As discussed above, the cited references do not teach or suggest the claimed subject matter and do not have the advantages obtained by the claimed invention. Therefore, withdrawal of the § 103 (a) rejection to Claim 2 is respectfully requested.

Claims 4-22 depend from Claim 2, and Claim 26 depends from Claim 24. Hence, withdrawal of the rejections to these claims is respectfully requested as well.

Based upon the foregoing, Applicants believe that all pending claims are in condition for allowance and such disposition is respectfully requested. In the event that a telephone conversation would further prosecution and/or expedite allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

SHERIDAN ROSS P.C.

By: 

Brian J. Ignat
Registration No. 57,174
1560 Broadway, Suite 1200
Denver, Colorado 80202-5141
(303) 863-9700

Date: 10/30/2007